



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,496	04/25/2001	Fabio Casati	10007893-1	7375

7590 08/15/2006
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

NANO, SARGON N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/842,496

Applicant(s)

CASATI ET AL.

Examiner

Sargon N. Nano

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 10, and 15 - 34 and 37 - 41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 10, and 15 - 34 and 37 - 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to amendment

1. This office action is responsive to amendment filed on May 30, 2006. Claims 1 – 10 and 15 – 34 and 37 – 41 are presented for examination. Claims 1 – 10 and 15 – 34 and 37 – 41 are pending examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 10 and 15 – 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Casati et al. eflow : A Platform for Developing and Managing Composite e-service published March 2000.

Casati discloses E services that are delivered point to point where these services provide value added integrated services which are delivered by composing existing services.(see abstract).

As to claim 1, Casati teaches a computer-enabled workflow process system, comprising:

a node group database that stores a group of work nodes referred to by a generic node, wherein a work node defines a workflow action and data items to be read and written when executing the workflow action (see page 4 col.2 paragraphs 3 and 4);

a workflow engine that executes a workflow process having the generic node, wherein the workflow engine accesses the node group database for the group of work

nodes when the generic node is to be executed so as to allow dynamic composition and modification of the workflow process(see page 4 col.2 paragraphs 3 , 4 and 5).

As to claim 2, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein work nodes can be added to or removed from the node group dynamically without requiring the workflow process to be redefined (see col. 3 lines 2 – 14).

As to claim 3, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the node group database stores a plurality of groups of work nodes, each being referred to by at least one generic node (see page 1 col. 2, paragraph 1).

As to claim 4, Casati teaches the system of claim 3, wherein each generic node can refer to more than one group of work nodes (see page 4 col. 2 paragraphs 1 and 2).

As to claim 5, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the workflow engine further comprises a static instance manager that manages execution of work nodes within the workflow process; an adaptive instance manager that accesses the node group database for the group of work nodes to replace the generic node (see page 4 col.2 paragraphs 2 and 3).

As to claim 6, Casati teaches the system of claim 5, wherein the adaptive instance manager receives attributes of the generic node to determine which work nodes within the group are to replace the generic node (see page 4 col. 2 paragraph 5 and fig. 7).

As to claim 7, Casati teaches the system of claim 5, wherein the adaptive instance manager further comprises:

a first set of instructions that receive attributes of the generic node from the group of work nodes; a second set of instructions that determine which work nodes within the group are described by the generic node (see page 2 col. 1 and col. 2 paragraphs 1 – 4).

As to claim 8, Casati teaches in a workflow process management system, a computer-implemented method of executing a workflow process having at least a generic node, comprising

storing a group of work nodes corresponding to the generic node in a node group database, wherein the node group database stores a plurality of groups of work nodes, wherein a work node defining a workflow action and data items to be read and written when executing the workflow action (see fig.7); accessing the node group database for the group of work nodes when the generic node is to be executed (see page 4 col. 2 paragraphs 3 and 4);

executing work nodes in the group such that the workflow process can be dynamically composed and modified without requiring that the workflow process be redefined(see page 1 col.2 paragraph 1).

As to claim 9, Casati teaches the method of claim 8, wherein work nodes can be added to or removed from the group without redefining its corresponding workflow process (see page 4 col.1 paragraph).

As to claim 10, Casati teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising the step of determining when the generic node in the workflow process is to be executed (see fig. 7).

As to claim 15, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein one of the work nodes defines a workflow action of collecting data for the workflow process (see fig.6).

As to claim 16, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the workflow process defines a moving service (see page 4 col.1 paragraphs 1 – 4).

As to claim 17, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the workflow process is an automation of a business process during which documents and information are passed from one participant to another participant (see page 5 col.1 paragraphs 3 – 5).

As to claim 18, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein at least one workflow node replaces the generic node during execution of the workflow process (see page 4 col.2 paragraph 5, and page 5 col.1 paragraph 3).

As to claim 19, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein attributes in the generic node govern which work nodes within the group of work nodes will replace the generic node during execution of the workflow process (see page 4 col.2 paragraph 5, and page 5 col.1 paragraph 3).

As to claim 20, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the node group database includes workflow actions that specify different shipping services (see fig. 7).

As to claim 21, Casati teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising collecting data with one of the work nodes during execution of the workflow process (see fig.8).

As to claim 22, Casati teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the workflow process defines a moving service (see fig.8).

As to claim 23, Casati teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising exchanging documents and information during the workflow process (see fig. 8).

As to claim 24, Casati teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising replacing the generic node with a workflow node during execution of the workflow process (see page 4 col. 2 paragraph 5).

As to claim 25, Casati teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising specifying, in attributes in the generic node, which work nodes within the group of work nodes will replace the generic node during execution of the workflow process (see page 4 col.2 paragraphs 5 and page 5 col.1 paragraphs 1 and 2).

As to claim 26, Casati teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the node group database includes workflow actions that specify different shipping services (see page 4 col. 2 paragraph 4 and fig. 7).

As to claim 27, Casati teaches a computer-enabled workflow process system, comprising: a node group database that stores plural work nodes, wherein each work node defines a different workflow action(see page 4 col. 2 paragraph 4 and fig. 7); a generic node having attributes that identify which work nodes are activated to replace the generic node during execution of a workflow process (see page 4 col. 2 paragraphs 2, 3 and 5); and a workflow engine that executes the workflow process having the generic node, wherein the workflow engine accesses, when the generic node is to be executed, the node group database to replace the generic node with at least one work node and to initiate the workflow action of the at least one work node(see page 4 col. 2 paragraphs 2, 3 and 5) .

As to claim 28, Casati teaches the system of claim 27, wherein plural work nodes are activated to replace the generic node during execution of the workflow process (see page 4 paragraph 3).

As to claim 29, Casati teaches the system of claim 28, wherein the plural work nodes activated to replace the generic node are executed in parallel (see page 4 paragraph 3).

As to claim 30, Casati teaches the system of claim 28, wherein the plural work nodes activated to replace the generic node are sequentially executed (see page 4 col. 2 paragraph 3).

As to claim 31, Casati teaches the system of claim 27, wherein values of the attributes are set at runtime by a previously executed work node (see page 4 col. 2 paragraph 5).

As to claim 32, Casati teaches the system of claim 27, wherein the workflow actions include moving services (see page 4 col. 2 paragraphs 3 and 4).

As to claim 33, Casati teaches the system of claim 27, wherein the work nodes include airline shipment and railway shipment (see fig 3).

As to claim 34, Casati teaches the system of claim 27, wherein work nodes in the node group database specify services that are performed by third parties during execution of the workflow process (see page 3 col. 1 paragraphs 2 – 5 and col. 2 paragraph 1).

As to claim 37, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the workflow engine determines if the nodes are generic after commencing execution of the workflow

process having generic node (see page 4 col.2 paragraph5 and page 5 col.1 paragraph 3).

As to claim 38, Casati teaches the system of claim 1, wherein different executions of a same generic node result in a different subset of work nodes being executed (see page 3 col. 1 paragraphs 3 and 4).

As to claim 39, Casati teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising: determining after executing work nodes in the generic nodes, if nodes in the workflow process are generic nodes (see fig.7).

As to claim 40, Casati teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising : executing the generic node more than one time while executing the workflow process (see fig.7).

As to claim 41, Casati teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising changing the configuration of the generic node while workflow process is being executed (see page 4 col.2 paragraph 5).

As to claim 42, Casati teaches the system of claim 27, further comprising: plural generic nodes, wherein each of the generic nodes has attributes that identify which work nodes are to be activated (see page 1 col. 2 paragraph 2).

Response to Argument

3. Applicant's arguments with have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2157

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sargon N. Nano whose telephone number is (571) 272-4007. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sargon Nano

Aug. 2, 2006


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100